

REMARKS

The present application was filed on November 26, 2003 with claims 1 through 25. Claims 1 through 25 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 13 and 25 are proposed to be amended herein and claims 3 and 15 are proposed to be cancelled herein, without prejudice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8, 13, 16-18, 20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell (United States Patent No. 5,991,882) and in view P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide (May 2002), rejected claims 2, 3, 7, 11, 14, 15, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell and in view P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide (May 2002) and in view of Honarvar et al. (United States Patent No. 7,231,657), and rejected claims 9, 10, 12, 21, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell and in view of P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide (May 2002) and in view of Kanevsky et al. (United States Patent No. 5,774,525).

Section 101 Rejection

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As noted by the Examiner, claim 25 is directed to an article of manufacture. As recited in claim 25, as amended, the article of manufacture comprises one or more (novel) programs *on a machine readable storage medium*. Applicants submit that an article of manufacture is explicitly recognized by section 101 ("manufacture") and is in full compliance with *In re Warmerdam*, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1759 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under Section 101.

Section 103 Rejection of Independent Claims

Independent claims 1, 13 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell in view P-Synch. With regard to claim 1, for example, the Examiner asserts the O'Connell discloses a method for generating a password for a user. The Examiner acknowledges that O'Connell does not expressly teach that a user cannot be correlated with the one or more personal details based on correlation rules.

The Examiner asserts, however, that discloses the step of ensuring that a correlation between said user and said proposed password does not violate one or more predefined correlation rules (citing pages 124 and 126).

As shown by the rules on page 126, P-Synch is performing a *table look-up* to ensure that one or more rules are not violated. For example, P-Synch ensures that a proposed password is not the user name or a variation thereof.

The present invention, on the other hand, guides the user to an appropriate password by presenting topics and ensures that a proposed password cannot be correlated with the user by performing an *Internet* search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from said proposed password; evaluating results of said search relative to one or more predefined thresholds; and rejecting said proposed password when said user is correlated with said proposed password if one or more of said predefined thresholds are exceeded by said results, as required by each independent claim, as amended. See, for example, Published Version of Application, Pars. 25 and 33. In this manner, the present invention is said to ensure that the authentication information provided by a user is not easily attacked. See, Abstract.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims under Section 103.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-12 and 14-24 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 13, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over O'Connell, P-Synch and Honarvar et al. (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 21 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. Claims 3 and 15 are proposed to be cancelled.

Conclusion

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824

Date: October 31, 2007